IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

MAGDALENA PEREZ,)
Plaintiff,)
V.) CIVIL ACTION NO. SA-22-CA-1060-FI
v.) CIVIL ACTION NO. 5A-22-CA-1000-FI
ROOT INSURANCE COMPANY,)
Defendant.)

ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge (docket no. 20) filed in the above-captioned cause on March 17, 2023. To date, no objections to the Report and Recommendation have been received.¹

Because no party has objected to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the Court need not conduct a de novo review. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings and recommendations to which objection is made."). The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation and finds its reasoning to be neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge (docket no. 20) is ACCEPTED pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) such that Plaintiff's

Any party who desires to object to a Magistrate's findings and recommendations must serve and file his, her or its written objections within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the findings and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 635(b)(1). If service upon a party is made by mailing a copy to the party's last known address, "service is complete upon mailing." FED. R. CIV. P. 5(b)(2)(C). If service is by electronic means, "service is complete upon transmission." *Id.* at (E).

Motion to Remand (docket no. 18) is DENIED. This case continues to be referred to the Magistrate Judge for further pretrial proceedings.

It is so ORDERED.

SIGNED this 3rd day of April, 2023.

ERED BIERY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE